

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the Application, of which claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31 and 41-44 are independent. The foregoing amendment amends claims 1, 5, 15, 16, 29, 30, 31, 41, 42, 43 and 44. No new matter is added.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Applicants amend claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31 and 41-44 to specify that the network object types represent one or more portions of different network device types on a communication network. For example, the network object types may represent a bridge, a router and a gateway.

Applicants amend claims 5 and 29 to correct typographical errors.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Applicants note claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161876 to Raymond *et al.* However, in the discussion of the applied Raymond *et al.* reference in Section 6 of the Office Action the name Miyake *et al.* appears in place of Raymond *et al.* Nevertheless, the quoted passages in Section 6 of the Office Action are from the Raymond *et al.* reference. Accordingly, Applicants address only the Raymond *et al.* reference below with respect to the rejection of claims 1-44.

Claims 1-14

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161876 to Raymond *et al.* (hereafter “Raymond”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is independent and claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 either directly or indirectly.

Claim 1 is directed to a method enabling a user to edit a table defining a view of a network object database including a plurality of network object types representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types on a communications network.

Performance of the method allows editing of at least one column of the table to change two or more of the specified network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network. That is, the claimed method enables a user to edit at least one column of a table to effectuate a change to two or more network object types that represent one or more portions of different network device types on the communications network. See, for example paragraph [0140] of the specification. In this manner, for example, a network administrator can initiate setting of objects representing one or more different devices by specifying one network object type and have the objects displayed in one column of a table. This allows the network administrator to readily manage different network devices of different network device *types*.

Raymond is generally directed to a service information portal for providing customer-based management information of networked computing environments for Internet service providers, outsources, and enterprise service providers (Raymond at Abstract). More specifically, Raymond allows for customized portal views of a network based on a user ID. See, paragraphs 96 and 97 of Raymond. However, Raymond does not allow any changes to be made to the different network device types.

Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest *in response to the user specifying the one or more network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network, editing at least one column of the table to change two or more of the specified network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network*, which is present in independent claim 1.

There is no indication in Raymond that at least one of a plurality of network objects representing *different network device types* can be changed by editing at least one column of a table. Rather, it seems that Raymond displays an object for each different type of network device type. See, Figures 12A, 12B and 12C of Raymond. Raymond does not allow a user to edit at least one column of a table to *change two or more of the specified network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network*.

Therefore, Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1.

Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every patentable feature of claim 1. Therefore, Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 2-10.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-14.

Claims 15-29

Claims 15-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 15 is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least *in response to the user specifying the one or more network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network, editing at least one column of the table to change two or more of the specified network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network*, which is present in claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 15. Claims 16-29 depend from claim 15 and, as such, include each and every patentable feature of claim 15. Therefore, Raymond does not disclose each and every element of claims 16-29. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 15-29.

Claim 30

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Independent claim 30 is a system claim corresponding to independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least the following features of claim 30: ***a table editing component to edit at least one column of the table to change two or more of the specified network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network***, which is present in claim 30.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 30. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 30.

Claims 31-40

Claims 31-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 31 is a computer readable medium claim directed to a method of editing a portable view definition of a network object database including a plurality of network object types. The method includes, amongst other acts, ***an act of editing a column of a table to change two or more of the plurality of network object types representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types on a communications network***.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least the following features of claim 31: ***an act of editing a column of a table to change two or more of the plurality of network object types representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types on a communications network***.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 31. Claims 32-40 depend from claim 31 and, as such, include

each and every patentable feature of claim 31. Therefore, Raymond does not disclose each and every element of claims 31-40.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 31-40.

Claim 41

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 41 is a computer readable medium claim corresponding to independent claim 31. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 41 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 31 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least the following features of claim 41: *editing a column of a table to change two or more of the plurality of network object types to represent one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network*, which is present in claim 41.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 41. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 41.

Claim 42

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 42 is a system claim corresponding to independent claim 31. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 42 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 31 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least the following features of claim 42: *a table editing component to edit a column of a table to change two or more of the plurality of network object types representing one or more portions of the*

plurality of different network device types on the communications network, which is present in claim 42.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 42. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 42.

Claim 43

Claim 43 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 43 is a system claim. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 43 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least the following features of claim 43: *a table editing component to edit a column of a table to change two or more of the plurality of network object types representing one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types on the communications network*, which is present in claim 43.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 43. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 43.

Claim 44

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Raymond. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 44 is a computer readable medium claim having stored thereon a plurality of computer readable signals defining a document. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 44 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 above. In particular, Raymond does not disclose or suggest at least the following features of claim 44: *a definition of a table representing a view of a network object database including a plurality of network object types, the table definition including a column representing one of the network object*

types of the network object database representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types on a communications network, which is present in claim 44.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Raymond does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 44. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 44.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants contend the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this statement. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-4876, under Order No. 118156-00902 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David R. Burns/
David R. Burns
Registration No.: 46,590
McCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
265 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 449-6500
(617) 607-9200 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant